CASE NO. 84-902

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM 1984

WARDAIR CANADA INC.,

Appellant,

vs.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,

Appellee.

ON APPEAL FROM THE
SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

MOTION TO DISMISS OR AFFIRM

LARRY E. LEVY
P. O. Box 10583
Tallahassee,
Florida 32302
(904) 224-1215

Counsel of Record
for Appellee

JIM SMITH
Attorney General

JOSEPH C. MELLICHAMP,
III, Assistant
Attorney General
The Capitol
Tallahassee, Fl.
(904) 487-2142

Attorneys for
Appellee, State of
Florida, Department
of Revenue

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

MOTION TO DISMISS OR AFFIRM

Appellee moves the Court to dismiss this appeal or to affirm the decision of the Supreme Court of Florida on the following grounds:

I. This appeal does not present a substantial federal question because all issues raised by the Appellant has been foreclosed by prior decisions of this Court.

II. The decision of the Supreme Court of Florida is consistent with prior decisions of this Court on the involved issues of law, many of which are cited in the Supreme Court's decision, and it is manifest that the questions on which the decision in this cause depends, are so insubstantial as not to need further argument.

STATEMENT

This appeal is from a decision of the Florida Supreme Court upholding the constitutionality of Chapter 83-3, Laws of Florida, except for §61, which involved a Florida corporate tax credit, which is unrelated to the Florida Sales Tax Law, Chapter 212, Florida Statutes. Chapter 83-3, supra, amended Chapter 212, Florida Statutes, which is commonly referred to as the "Sales Tax Law of Florida". The statute, Chapter 212, Florida Statutes, has been construed by the Florida Supreme Court and other Florida appellate courts on numerous occasions, as being an excise tax levied on the privilege of engaging in certain businesses and transactions as provided for in the statute. Gaulden v. Kirk, 47 So.2d 567 (Fla. 1950)

Florida Revenue Commission v. Maas Brothers, Inc., 226 So.2d 849 (Fla. 1 DCA 1969); cert. den. 237 So.2d 177; Estate of W. T. Grant Co. v. Lewis, 358 So.2d 76, (Fla.1 DCA 1978); 370 So.2d 764 (Fla.1979); Kirk v. Western Contracting Company, 216 So.2d 503 (Fla. 1 DCA 1968), cert. den. 225 So.2d 535; app. dism. 226 So.2d 815; Ryder Truck Rental v. Bryant, 170 So.2d 822 (Fla. 1964); Green v. Panama City Housing Authority, 115 So.2d 560 (Fla. 1959). The decision in this cause merely restates the position of the highest Court of the State of Florida, to the effect that the excise taxes imposed under Chapter 212, Florida Statutes, are imposed on the privilege of engaging in certain businesses, and are levied on the vendor, for the exercise of such privilege.

Motor fuel and special fuel are taxable under Chapters 212, 206, and 207, Florida Statutes. These several statutes generally interface to some extent because

the Legislature has attempted to utilize the same as part of the body of law of the State of Florida to generate taxes for the operation of government and taxes for public transportation. Prior to April 1, 1983, the effective date of Chapter 83-3, supra, motor fuel and special fuel which were not subject to the 8 cents tax imposed by Chapter 206, Florida Statutes, were taxable under the sales tax law, Chapter 212, Florida Statutes, in the following manner. §212.08(4), F.S., exempted motor fuels and special fuels on which a tax was imposed by Chapter 206 or Chapter 207, Florida Statutes. Aircraft was not within the definitions found in Chapters 206 or 207, Florida Statutes, and accordingly paid no tax under either Chapter 207, Florida Statutes, or Part I or Part II of Chapter

206, Florida Statutes. Truckers, as common carriers, did pay tax under Chapter 207, F.S., and paid tax under Chapter 206, F.S., although a credit was allowed on the taxes paid under Chapter 206, F.S., if tax was paid under Chapter 207, F.S. Truck common carriers were allowed to pro-rate tax under Chapter 207, Florida Statutes. See §207.005(2), F.S.

Since the airlines paid no tax under Chapters 206 or 207, F.S., the exemption found in §212.08(4), F.S., exempting purchases of fuels which had been subjected to tax under Chapters 206 and 207, F.S., did not apply to the airlines. However, airlines did receive pro-ration under §212.08(4), F.S.

Airlines generally lease space and the right to use government owned airport facilities in Florida and at one time were required to pay ad valorem real property taxes on such use and occupancy. However, the Legislature in 1980 enacted Chapter 80-368, Laws of Florida, so as to relieve airlines from the burden of having to pay local ad valorem taxes on such leased property used for airline purposes.

Prior to the effective date of Chapter 83-3, supra, vessels and railroads, like aircraft, were allowed to pro-rate the tax by virtue of the provisions found in Chapter 212, Florida Statutes. See §212.08(4), §212.08(8), and §212.08(9), F.S. However, vessels and railroads were

not exempt from the provisions of Part I of Chapter 206, F.S., on purchases of motor fuel, but were exempt as were aircraft from the provisions of Part II of Chapter 206, F.S., and Chapter 207, F.S., both of which contained taxes on such fuel in a specified amount per gallon. Chapter 83-3, supra, removed from the statute, the authority which allowed airlines to pro-rate taxes. Truck line common carriers were required to pay both the taxes imposed under Chapter 206, F.S., and any which may be due under Chapter 207, F.S., and the new tax imposed in Part II of Chapter 212, Florida Statutes, through the enaction of Chapter 83-3, supra. Vessels and railroads continue to receive the pro-ration found in

§212.08(4), F.S., but also continue to be liable for taxes imposed under Part I of Chapter 206, F.S.

Although Appellant argues strenuously that the tax imposed under Chapter 212, Florida Statutes, is a user fee or user tax, this contention was rejected by the Trial Court both factually and legally. Although the Appellee does not agree that such question is a factual issue, and in fact, in another case pending on appeal involving the same statute,[1] no testimony was taken, even if such were a factual issue, it has been resolved against

---

[1] Northeastern Airways, Inc., and Arrow Air, Inc., v. State of Florida, Department of Revenue Case No. 84-929

the Appellant, by the Trial Court which is the trier of fact, and affirmed by the Florida Supreme Court.

The Appellant's argument premised in part on the false assumption that the taxes imposed under Chapter 212, Florida Statutes, are user fees. This is not, and never has been true.

It is significant that all foreign air carriers and all United States air carriers purchasing fuel in the United States were subjected to taxes in exactly the same manner both before and after the enaction of Chapter 83-3, Laws of Florida.

The agreement between the United States and Canada, upon which Appellant relies, provides in part:

> 2. Neither Contracting Party shall give a preference to its own carriers over the carriers of the other Contracting Party in the application of its customs, immigration, quarantine,

and similar regulations or in the use of airports, airways, and other facilities under its control.

. . .

Neither Contracting party shall discriminate against a carrier or among carriers of the other Contracting Party providing the services covered by this Agreement.

Non Scheduled Air Service Agreement, U.S. - Canada, Articles XIII and XIV, T.I.A.S. 7826.

Article XII of said agreement provides:

Each Contracting Party shall exempt the carriers of the other Contracting Party to the fullest extent possible under its national law from import restrictions customs, duties, excise taxes, inspection fees, and other national duties and charges on fuels, lubricants, consumable technical supplies . . .

Non Scheduled Air Service Agreement U.S. - Canada, Article II, Paragraph 1, T.I.A.S. 7826.

No specific exemption is provided in any of the international agreements for state excise taxes such as that imposed

under Chapter 212, Florida Statutes, as amended by Chapter 83-3, Laws of Florida.

POINTS I AND II

POINT I. THIS APPEAL DOES NOT PRESENT A SUBSTANTIAL FEDERAL QUESTION BECAUSE ALL ISSUES RAISED BY THE APPELLANT HAVE BEEN FORECLOSED BY PRIOR DECISIONS OF THIS COURT.

POINT II. THE DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA IS CONSISTENT WITH PRIOR DECISIONS OF THIS COURT ON THE INVOLVED ISSUES OF LAW, MANY OF WHICH ARE CITED IN THE SUPREME COURT'S DECISION, AND IT IS MANIFEST THAT THE QUESTIONS ON WHICH THE DECISION IN THIS CAUSE DEPENDS, ARE SO INSUBSTANTIAL AS NOT TO NEED FURTHER ARGUMENT.

A. THE FLORIDA SUPREME COURT'S DECISION IS CONSISTENT WITH THIS COURT'S DECISION IN JAPAN LINE LTD. V. COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES. 441 U.S. 434 (1979).

It should be remembered that the exemption sought by foreign airlines is inconsistent with the Articles in the

agreement which provide that neither party shall discriminate against a carrier or among carriers of the other Contracting Party providing the services covered by the agreement, and which provide that neither Contracting Party shall give a preference to its own carriers over the carriers of the other Contracting Party. Thus, that which is sought by the Appellant would effectively destroy this competitive equality because it would provide an exemption from state taxation to the Appellant while purchasing fuel in the United States, which such exemption is not permitted to United States domestic airlines purchasing fuel in Florida traveling and competing on the same routes as the foreign airlines. The effect of this is to have Florida and the United States subsidizing foreign airlines in competition with domestic airlines. Thus the

discriminatory practice sought by the Appellant is totally inconsistent with the terms of the agreement itself, which in effect seek as a goal nondiscriminatory practices and action against the airlines of the other Contracting Party. It is also inconsistent with the goal announced in the Preamble of the Agreement of desiring to insure continued development of a system of air transport free from discriminatory practices. (See Non-Scheduled Air Services Agreement, May 8, 1974, T.I.A.S. 7826 and the previously quoted provisions of the agreement.) So it is not freedom from discrimination in taxing practices which is sought by the Appellant, but is instead in fact, a competitive advantage which is sought, which would allow the Appellant to be free from taxes which would be imposed

upon dealers selling fuel to United States airlines in the State of Florida. So that which is sought by the foreign airlines is a competitive advantage, not equality of treatment in competition.

Although the provisions in the Agreement relating to discrimination do not specifically speak to taxes, by their terms, these clauses suggest a purpose of guaranteeing a fair and equal opportunity to operate and compete over the designated routes. The State Department's official Digest of International Law, 9 Whiteman Digest of International Law, 457-58 (1968) suggests that the goal of these provisions was to avoid subsidization of one airline more than another so that one carrier could give the same service at a lower rate. However, even assuming that the fair and

equal opportunity to operate provisions do relate to taxes, it is obvious that Florida's excise tax levied on the sale of fuel in the State of Florida, is consistent with these international agreement provisions because it taxes foreign airlines and domestic airlines identically. This Court has recognized that the language of a Treaty wherever reasonably possible will be construed so as not to override state laws or to impair rights arising under them. Guarantee Trust Co. v. United States, 304 U.S. 126 (1938), in Estate of Ghio, 108 P. 516 (Calif. 1910), aff'd. Rocco v. Thompson, 223 U.S. 317 (1912) in which

the Court stated that:

> "Such intent is not to be lightly imputed to the federal government, and that it cannot be allowed to exist except where the language used in a treaty plainly expresses it, or necessarily implies it. . ."

It has also been recognized that even treaties with foreign nations will be carefully construed so as not to derogate from the authority and states of this nation unless clearly necessary to effectuate the national policy. United States v. Pink. 305 U.S. 203 (1942).

In Hines v. Davidowitz, 312 U.S. 52 (1941), this Court discussed state laws which were conflicting, contrary to, or repugnant to federal law in the context of a state law dealing with regulation of aliens, which it was conceded was a matter

exclusively with the Federal Government's jurisdiction. This Court pointed out, however, that concurrent state laws could not be enacted dealing with the same general subject, but distinguished that fact situation from the situation where the states' sovereign power to tax was involved and stated:

> Any concurrent state power that may exist is restricted to the narrowest of limits; the state's power here is not bottomed on the same broad base as is its power to tax. And it is also of importance that this legislation deals with the rights, liberties, and personal freedoms of human beings, and is in an entirely different category from state tax statutes or state pure food laws regulating the labels on cans.

312 U.S. at page 58.

The footnote found therein is also significant. It provides:

> Express recognition of the breadth of the concurrent taxing power of state and nation is found in Federalist paper No. 32.

With this general understanding of certain provisions found in the agreement and of the general power of states to tax absent express and clear restriction by the federal government, Appellant's contention that the Supreme Court's decision is inconsistent with Japan Line will be considered.

First, it should be pointed out that Appellant's statement that fuel should be likened to the containers involved in Japan Line is incorrect. The containers in Japan Line were in fact instrumentalities used for shipping property into the United States. The containers would be likened to the aircraft themselves and not to the fuel which is consumed by the aircraft in flying into the United States. Thus, the Appellant's statement that the fuel is an instrumentality of commerce is totally false

and incorrect. Furthermore, the Appellant is incorrect in stating that Florida imposes a tax on aviation fuel. This is not true. Florida's tax is an excise tax imposed upon the privilege of engaging in the business of selling tangible personal property which includes fuel. The excise tax is imposed on the vendor or dealer and is a privilege tax not a property tax as suggested by the Appellant, and which was before this Court in Japan Line. Florida's excise tax on the privilege of engaging in business, is totally dissimilar from the ad valorem property tax imposed on the property itself, in that case, the containers. Understandably, the Appellant is trying to change the nature of the Florida tax so as to support an argument that the Florida Supreme Court's decision is inconsistent with the Japan Line. There is no com-

parison; in Japan Line the tax was a personal property tax levied on the containers which were temporarily within the United States in California. The containers were owned by nationals in Japan and were taxed in Japan through the levy of an unapportioned property tax. Florida is not taxing the fuel even if it were an instrument of commerce, which it is not. The fuel which is sold which gives rise to the excise tax levied under Florida law is fuel owned by United States businesses, physically located in Florida, whose taxable event or incident occurs on the first sale or transfer or withdrawal from storage which is also within the State of Florida. That same fuel could not be withdrawn from storage for use in any other foreign country.

In Japan Line, this Court set forth two additional requirements to the "four prong" test referred to in Complete Auto Transit v. Brady, 430 U.S. 274 (1977). The first was whether the tax, notwithstanding apportionment, creates a substantial risk of international multiple taxation, and second whether the tax prevents the federal government from "speaking with one voice when regulating commercial regulations with foreign governments." The decision of the Florida Supreme Court is consistent with Japan Line and meets both of the additional tests. First, since the legal incident of the withdrawal from storage for use can occur only once, that legal incident could not be taxed in any foreign country. This situation is totally dif-

ferent from the factual situation before this Court in Japan Line, because in that case, the containers being taxed were taxed because of their physical location in California, even though such physical location was of a temporary nature. The containers were used to transport merchandise and could be compared to vessels used for the transportation of property from a foreign country to the United States. The containers had entered the United States pursuant to a Customs Convention on containers which granted containers temporary admission free of import duties and import taxes and free of import prohibitions and restrictions provided they are used solely in foreign

commerce and are subject to reexportation. The containers were designated "instruments of international traffic". Since the containers were capable of physical relocation, and in fact were physically relocated periodically as instrumentalities transporting property in foreign commerce, such containers could physically be located in some other country, and since the tax imposed was a personal property tax which turned on the situs of the personal property, it is readily apparent that multiple taxation could easily occur. Thus, the tax imposed in Japan Line was a state tax on instrumentalities of foreign commerce, which is totally unlike the tax imposed in the case at bar, which is an excise tax imposed on dealers for the privilege of engaging in the business of

selling fuel in the United States whose legal incident is on the withdrawal from storage for use. This can only occur once, and that is in the State of Florida. Furthermore, in Japan Line, it was established that Japan has the right and the power to tax the containers in full, and in fact did tax such containers under the property tax law in Japan. So, because the legal incident giving rise to the tax was physical situs, multiple taxation in fact did occur.

Appellant's suggestion that a risk of double taxation is sufficient to invalidate the tax simply is not supported by Japan Line. Furthermore, Appellant's speculation that after the airplane lands in a foreign country, the foreign country may impose a tax on whatever fuel is left in the tanks of the aircraft upon landing is exactly that; pure speculation.

Furthermore, the State of Florida does not attempt to tax any fuel retained on board the airlines upon arrival into the State of Florida. Thus, the multiple taxation in fact which existed in Japan Line is not present in the case at bar. Thus, the Florida Supreme Court's decision is consistent with this Court's pronouncement in Japan Line in this regard.

Japan Line was discussed by this Court in Container Corp. of America v. Franchise Tax Board, 463 U.S. 159 (1983). In discussing Japan Line, this Court pointed out that in that case California had levied an apportioned, non-discriminatory, ad valorem property tax on cargo containers which were instrumentalities of foreign commerce and which were temporarily located in various ports. This Court pointed out that the same cargo containers were subject to an unapportioned property tax in their home

port of Japan. It also recognized that a convention agreement signed by the United States and Japan made clear at least that neither national government could impose a tax on temporarily imported cargo containers whose home port was in the other nation. This Court emphasized that the tax fell on an instrumentality of commerce, which was temporarily domiciled abroad; that is, the containers themselves. This Court in Container Corp. then stated that " . . . on the basis of the facts in Japan Line, we concluded that the California tax at issue was constitutionally proper. . ."

This Court in Container then distinguished the situation in Container from that in Japan Line by pointing out (1) that it involves a tax on income rather than a tax on property, (2) the reasons for allocation to a single situs that often apply in the case of property taxation carry little

force in the case of income taxation; (3) double taxation in the Container Corp. case, although real, was not the "inevitable" result of the California taxing scheme. This Court pointed out that in Japan Line, it had relied strongly on the fact that one taxing jurisdiction claimed the right to tax the containers value in full and another taxing jurisdiction claimed the right to tax the same containers in part, which was a combination resulting necessarily in double taxation. Furthermore, this Court recognized that the terms of the treaties involved in Container Corp. did not include taxing activities of sub-national governmental units such as states, stating:

> Third, None of the tax treaties into which the United States has entered covers the taxing activities of sub-national units such as states.

It pointed out that the Senate had on at least one occasion, considering a proposed treaty, declined to give its consent to a provision in the treaty so as to

include a restriction on state taxation. This is significant because the agreement involved in the case does not cover the taxing activities of sub-national units such as states. Thus, the Florida Supreme Court's decision is consistent with this Court's decision in Container Corp. because it too recognized that the agreement relied upon as a basis for avoiding state taxation only spoke to national taxes and not state taxes. Thus, this Court upheld the imposition of the California income tax distinguishing that situation from the situation involving the property tax on containers involved in Japan Line.

Florida's tax is an excise tax imposed on Florida dealers for the privilege of engaging in the business of selling fuel. This privilege is exercised solely within

the State of Florida and applies to all airlines, foreign and domestic, purchasing fuel in the State of Florida. The legal incidence of levy is the first withdrawal for use, and this can occur only once. Florida is not attempting to tax fuel brought into the United States aboard foreign airlines coming into Florida. Since this legal incident can occur only once, no multiple taxation in fact could exist. This is totally dissimilar from the situation in Japan Line where the containers were subject to both property tax in California and an unapportioned like tax in Japan. Thus, the Florida Court's decision is consistent with this Court's decisions in Container Corp. and Japan

Line.

B. THE AIR TRANSPORT INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT DOES NOT EXEMPT FOREIGN AIRLINES FROM IMPOSITION OF A STATE EXCISE TAX ON THE PURCHASE OF FUELS IN A STATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

Appellant apparently acknowledges that none of the agreements provide for the specific exemption which it seeks but nevertheless suggests that somehow Florida's excise tax prevents the United States from speaking with one voice. The United States has spoken and has not chosen to exempt foreign airlines from state excise taxes imposed on purchases of fuel in any state in the United States. One reason for this is obvious. The purpose of the international agreement is to ensure competitive equality. If the United States

had exempted foreign airlines from imposition of state excise taxes, this could mean that the state would still impose taxes on sales to domestic airlines on such purchases of fuel, but could not collect a similar tax on sales to foreign airlines competing with the domestic airlines over the same routes. This would destroy the competitive equality demanded by the agreements and would leave the United States in the position of subsidizing foreign airlines at the expense of the domestic carriers. Furthermore, prior to April 1, 1983, when Chapter 83-3, Laws of Florida, was enacted, foreign airlines and domestic airlines were required to pay the excise tax imposed on fuel sold in Florida, and such tax was

apportioned. If the agreement exempted foreign airlines from the purchases of fuel since the inception, (the 1940's) then <u>why were the foreign airlines paying the tax prior to April 1, 1983</u>?

The Appellant attempts to rewrite the agreement to provide for a specific exemption from state taxation. <u>None</u> of the agreements contain such an exemption so the statement made by Appellant that the Florida Supreme Court ignored the terms of the agreement is totally without basis. The Florida Supreme Court did not ignore the terms of the agreement and in fact examined same and recognized that no specific exemption from state excise taxes was provided for in such agreements.

By limiting the self-executing provisions pertaining to taxes in the agreements to only national taxes and duties, the Executive Branch has indicated an intent not to invade the state's power to tax (some agreements do not even speak to any taxation). Federal preemption of state taxation should never be implied nor inferred, so the absence of any specific preemption of the state's power to tax would certainly suggest that no intent existed to invade the state's taxing power.

The Florida Supreme Court squarely recognized that there was no statutory provision found in the Appellant's involved agreement which provided for exemption from state excise taxes. Article XII of the agreement only speaks to <u>national</u> duties and charges on fuel.

The agreement has spoken with one voice and has chosen to remain silent on the subject of state excise taxes, no doubt recognizing the state's sovereign power to tax, thus, the agreements have not preempted the taxing power. As this Court knows from the companion cases involving foreign airlines which are also being appealed to this Court, some of the agreements speak to the United States using its best efforts to secure an exemption from state taxes, but this too would fall far short of declaring a national policy of preempting state taxation.[1]

The language of a treaty wherever reasonable possible will be construed so as not to override state laws or to impair rights arising under them Guarantee Trust Co. v. United States, 304 U.S. 126 (1938).

---

[1]Air Jamaica Limited, et al. v. State of Florida, Department of Revenue, Case No. 84-1041; Lineas Aereas Costarricenses, S.A., et al. v. State of Florida, Department of Revenue, Case No. 84-922.

The Florida Supreme Court recognized that the provision in the agreement dealing with national duties and excise taxes applied only to national customs duties and excise taxes and charges. The Florida Supreme Court recognized that the purpose of the agreement was to preserve and promote the continued development of a system of air transport free from discriminatory practices and to support equal commercial opportunity between the nations. It pointed out that the competitive equality would be destroyed if the United States air carriers had to pay state excise taxes on fuel purchases and the foreign carriers did not. In doing so, the Florida Supreme Court relied upon this Court's decision in Pennsylvania v. Nelson, 350 U.S. 497 (1956) and applied the three-prong test to determine the supremacy of a federal regulatory scheme over the state

regulation in the same or similar area. Thus, the Florida Supreme Court's decision is consistent with (1) the language of the various agreements themselves, and (2) this Court's application of the three-prong test in Nelson.

Any examination of federal restriction on state taxing power must be viewed in light of this Court's statement in Hines v. Davidowitz, 312 U.S. 52 (1941). That case discussed the concurrent powers of the state and recognized that the state's power to tax was bottomed on a much broader base than that being considered in Hines. The case at bar is not a situation where federal preemption exists because the agreement speaks only to national taxes and not to state taxes. The language in the agreement is totally dissimilar from the language in the treaty provision in the

case of Republic of Finland v. Town of Pelham, 270 N.Y.S. 661, in which Article 21 of the treaty provided:

> "Lands and buildings situated in the territory of either High Contracting Party, of which the other High Contracting Party is the legal or equitable owner and which are used exclusively for governmental purposes by that owner, shall be exempt from taxation of every kind, National, State, Provincial and Municipal, other than assessments levied for services or local public improvements by which the premises are benefited." (49 U.S. Stat. 2675) (e.s.)

The Executive Branch of the Federal Government has spoken only to national taxes. The Appellant is asking this Court to ignore this and in effect, asking this Court to amend or rewrite the agreements to include an exemption from state excise taxes.

Accordingly, the federal questions presented are plainly insubstantial and it is manifest that the questions on which the decision in this Cause depends are so insubstantial as not to need further argument.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above and foregoing reasons, the Appellee urges the Court to grants its Motion to Dismiss the appeal or to affirm the decision of the Supreme Court of Florida, because this appeal does not present a substantial federal question inasmuch as the decision of the Supreme Court of Florida is consistent with prior decisions of this Court, and it is manifest that the questions on which the decision in this Cause depends are so insubstantial as not to need further argument.

Respectfully submitted,

LARRY E. LEVY
P. O. Box 10583
Tallahassee,
Florida 32302
(904) 224-1215

Counsel of Record
for Appellee

JIM SMITH
Attorney General

JOSEPH C. MELLICHAMP, III, Assistant
Attorney General
The Capitol
Tallahassee, Fla.
(904) 487-2142

Attorneys for
Appellee, State of
Florida, Department
of Revenue

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, LARRY E. LEVY, depose and say that I am Counsel of Record for Appellee, State of Florida, Department of Revenue, and that on February 1, 1985, I served a copy of the foregoing Motion to Dismiss or Affirm on each of the parties required to be served herein as follows:

On Appellant, WARDAIR CANADA, INC., by mailing copies in duly addressed envelopes, with first class postage prepaid, to Walter D. Hansen, Burwell, Hansen, Manley & Peters, 1706 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009.

All parties required to be served have been served.

LARRY E. LEVY
P. O. Box 10583
Tallahassee, Florida 32302
(904) 224-1215

Counsel of Record
for Appellee